

REMARKS

Claims 46-62 are pending. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestions regarding the format of the Abstract of the Disclosure. The Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended and is believed to be in proper form.

The disclosure has been objected to as failing to include headings. The disclosure has been amended to insert headings. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 23-33 have been objected to as being duplicative of Claims 2-12. Claims 1-45, including Claims 2-12 and 23-33 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, wherein the Examiner stated essentially that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "ArEcvideo." Claim 15 has been cancelled. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 33, 35, and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, wherein the Examiner essentially that that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "artificial reality (AR)". The phrase "artificial reality (AR)" has been amended to "augmented reality (AR)". Claims 16, 33, 35, and 44 have been cancelled. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-8, 12, 16, 20-22, 25-29, 33-41, 44, and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrington (USPN 6,898,307). The Examiner stated essentially that Harrington teaches all the limitations of Claims 1, 4-8, 12, 16, 20-22, 25-29, 33-

41, 44, and 45. Claims 1, 4-8, 12, 16, 20-22, 25-29, 33-41, 44, and 45 have been cancelled.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Jaszlics (USPN 6,166,744). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Harrington and Jaszlics teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 2 and 23. Claims 2 and 23 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Baldwin (USPN 5,701,444). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Harrington and Baldwin teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 3 and 24. Claims 3 and 24 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 31, 32, 41, and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Bimber (USPN 6,803,928). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Harrington and Bimber teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 31, 32, 41, and 42. Claims 10, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 31, 32, 41, and 42 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington. The Examiner stated essentially that Harrington teaches or suggests all the limitations of Claims 9 and 30. Claims 9 and 30 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 46-62 have been added. At least Claims 46, 54, 61, and 62 are believed to be allowable in view of the prior art of record. For example, the prior art of record is not believed to teach or suggest "producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model of the product superimposed on the moving model plane in the video data and having the pose of the moving model plane" as claimed in Claims 46, 54, 61, and 62.

Claims 47-53 depend from Claim 46. Claims 55-60 depend from Claim 54. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 46 and 54.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 46-62 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Michele L. Conover
Michele L. Conover
Reg. No. 34,962
Attorney for Applicants

Date: March 8, 2006

Customer No. 58254
SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
5th Floor
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3100
(732) 321-3030 (FAX)